DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 315 UD 012 078

AUTHOR Hill, Curdina J.
TITLE Evaluation of the Boston Resource Team, 1970-1971.
INSTITUTION Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, Mass.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Consultation Programs; Curriculum Development; Inner City; Mathematics Instruction; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; *Resource Teachers; School Community Relationship; Science Instruction; Secondary Education; *Teacher Workshops; Tutorial Programs; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of the attempt of the Boston resource team to improve the physical and educational conditions in the Dearborn school district during the 1970-71 school year. The team identified four goals for its work in the Dearborn annex: (1) improving the physical appearance of the Dearborn school; (2) involving more parents in the school; (3) instituting a more relevant curriculum for the students; and, (4) improving the morale of the school staff and the students. The team decided that the creation of a resource room which would totally involve the school, its students and teachers, and the community, would effectively address all four goals at once. A tutorial program was coordinated by a team member, involving the services of ten students from MIT's Black Student Union. A project was conceived by the Elementary Science Study Program to encourage students to develop units in which science and mathematics were interrelated. A ten-week workshop was run in the Fall of 1970 for the 18 member teaching staff of the Annex, the seventh and eighth grades of the Dearborn School. Tne workshop introduced various reading methods and ways of relating these to the different subject areas and assisted teachers in developing curriculum materials. (Author/JM)

ED 059315

EVALUATION OF THE BOSTON RESOURCE TEAM

1970-1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Curdina J. Hill

Pilot Communities Program
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02160

UD 012078

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	FORWARD	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
	A. School Context	2
	B. Program Operation in 1969-1970	4
III.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND GOALS	5
IV.	FORMATIVE EVALUATION	10
	A. Reading Workshop	10
	B. The Learning Fair	14
	C. A Community Coordinated Drug Education Workshop	17
V.	SUMMATIVE EVALUATION	20
	A. Student Interviews	20
	B. Teacher Interviews	22
	C. Classroom Observations	28
	D. Teacher Questionnaire	35
VI.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	41
APPENDIX		
	Questionnaire Analysis of Reading Workshop	A-1
	Teacher Interview	A-5
	Classroom Observation Form	A-6
	Teacher Questionnaire	A-13
	Tables from Teacher Questionnaire	A-20

I. FORWARD

From 1967-69, the Boston Resource Team had worked in two Boston school districts, the Andrew and the Dearborn. But in 1970, with cutbacks in federal funds and a reduced staff, the smaller and now all black team channeled their entire effort into the Dearborn school district--the district they felt could benefit most. This report is an evaluation of their attempt to improve the physical and educational conditions in that school district during the 1970-71 school year.

The evaluation is both formative and summative. The evaluator provided periodic informal feedback to team members by attending team workshops, by interviewing students, and by writing and analyzing a teacher questionnaire given at the end of a reading workshop. The summative evaluation of this program done to determine the extent to which the team met its goals, consisted of a teacher questionnaire, classroom observations, interviews with students, teachers and school administrators. The teacher questionnaire and classroom observations were also used in a control school district.

II. BACKGROUND

A. School Context

The Palmer, the Dearborn and the Dearborn Annex--the schools that make up the Dearborn school district--stand in the heart of a public housing project in Roxbury. Trash and broken glass litter the streets around the buildings. All their students are on Aid to Dependent Children and 98% are black. They are schools that mirror the economic and social neglect of their community. One school administrator attempted to explain the difficulty of trying to educate and teach here: "The problems that arise in the projects settle here in the school...There is a lot of confusion constantly." And the community, whose problems penetrate so much of school life, stays out of the school. The principal and her staff, realizing the importance of having an "awakened" community, want community people involved in the schools. But one school person explains: "The area is a Model Cities Area III, which just does not have strong leaders. Anyone who makes it, moves out."

Many of its problems typify inner-city schools. Although its principal is black, forty-seven of her fifty-six member teaching

staff are white. Teacher turnover is high, and many beginning teachers come to the school hoping to transfer as soon as possible. However, the frustration of teaching here is not limited to the surrounding environment. One teacher explains part of the frustration. "The school stinks. The school lacks everything. There are no materials, the curriculum is inadequate, shop is poorly equipped. It doesn't provide alternatives for the kids. They have no choice of courses." And most important, its students are not learning.

To improve students' basic reading skills, the Dearborn school committee used Title I funds to institute a performance contract reading program entitled "Words in Color" in grades three through six during the 1970-71 school year. Because of the demands of this additional program on the teachers' and students' time, the EDC team directed most of their efforts toward helping the seventh and eighth grades in the Dearborn Annex. The approach of the EDC program differed radically in style and substance from that of the "Words in Color" program; however, this did not present a major problem. The two groups worked along side one another throughout the year without friction.

B. Program Operation in 1969-70

The 1969-70 EDC Resource Team program in the schools consisted mainly of workshops, consultant services and materials for teachers. But the evaluation of the team's efforts in the two school districts revealed that the team was dispersing its efforts in too many areas beside the schools--the resource center, the community, and the colleges. In the 1969-70 evaluation, the Dearborn school staff had expressed much dissatisfaction with EDC people and the EDC program. Although they liked the materials and the workshops, they characterized the team as self-centered, unreliable, disorganized and unaware of teaching pressures. The Dearborn teachers wanted: EDC objectives clearly defined; classroom support in certain areas like math and reading; better consultant relations with teachers; and mutual planning with school staff. To promote better school relations, the team invited the school administrators to its summer workshops and started working on some of these suggestions.

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND GOALS

The team identified four goals for its work in the Dearborn Annex:

1. improving the physical appearance of the Dearborn school
2. involving more parents in the school
3. instituting a more relevant curriculum for the students
4. improving the morale of the school staff and the students

The team decided that the creation of a resource room which would totally involve the school, its students and teachers, and the community, would effectively address all four goals at once; and answer teachers' suggestions that the team provide an alternative learning environment for the students, work directly with students, concentrate their efforts, be accessible to teachers and involve community people in the school.

The Resource Room evolved as a collaborative effort between the school and the team. The school provided space in the basement for this room, releasing a school person to act as coordinator and

liaison person. It was a focal point around which most of the team's activities were centered. Here, workshops for students were held, a special black history library was housed and audio-visual and photographic equipment was made available for the teacher's use.

Taking as their working theme "Dearborn is beautiful," team members immediately began to transform the basement into a colorful resource room. They applied pressure through other community organizations to get the Dearborn painted and to have faulty wiring, broken windows and other things repaired. They also:

1. Trained teachers by giving workshops in reading, math, and Tri-wall.

2. Helped teachers in their efforts to make the curriculum relevant by:

   a. Providing audio-visual and photographic equipment, books, filmstrips, and other materials.

   b. Coordinating the Unified Science and Mathematics for Elementary Schools Project (USMES).

   c. Providing a special library with black history and literature books.

   d. Operating a resource room with special projects for the students in science, photography, arts, and crafts.

   e. Supporting an MIT tutoring program with tutoring help given in math and English.

   f. Providing a drug workshop for students.

3. Promoted community involvement in the school by:

   a. Conducting an educational awareness workshop for parents.

   b. Attracting parents to two Learning Fairs.

   c. Hiring two community aides to work in the resource room.

   d. Operating the resource room and running the resource center

4. Training team members by providing an urban teaching course in reading.

These activities and programs were designed to improve the morale of the staff and students.

This report on the team's work describes selected aspects of team workshops and the Learning Fair. There were also two other projects that were significant to the total program--the MIT tutorial program and the USMES project.

1. Tutorial Program. One team member coordinated the activities of ten students from MIT's Black Student Union who gave special help to ninety Annex students to enable them to take the Boston Latin Exams. Seventh graders received help in remedial math and science; the eighth graders in math, vocabulary and creative writing, and one group of students in computer work.

The results of their efforts were substantial. Ten students were able to take the Boston Latin Exams and one student actually passed. The program also contributed to the school by offering positive models of identification for the students. One teacher explains:

> I found the tutorial program to be very valuable for the black students in math, science, and English. MIT students gave them a very positive experience and provided a certain image for them. Here they were, students who were black, and making it at a place like MIT. It showed them you could come from the ghetto and still make it. There was hope!

The resource coordinator in a progress report said this about the program:

> In speaking with the teachers involved and the students, it is the consensus that these tutors have presented a positive image to our school. Basically they have shared enrichment experiences with the students. They worked in making themselves part of our school and on the days they were not here the students would ask for them by name which is a good indication that the students did know and care who they were.

2. USMES Project. The USMES Project was conceived by the Elementary Science Study Program as a way of encouraging students to develop units in which science and math were interrelated. It emphasized approaches to learning in which the student's interests and abilities would determine the pace, the content and the skills learned at any one time. Cooperating with this project, the Boston team set up

a design lab in the Dearborn Main Building. Two team members assisted in running the activities in this room. Here students learned about simple electrical units like batteries and bulbs and advanced to planning and setting up such things as a burglar alarm system for a house. The room was well-received by the school and led one staff member to say, "There need to be more design labs in this school."

IV. FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Formative feedback to team members consisted of reports on the following events--a reading workshop, a drug education workshop, and a learning fair.

A. Reading Workshop

Dr. Nancy Curtis, the team director, ran a ten-week workshop in the fall of 1970 for the eighteen-member teaching staff of the Annex, the seventh and eighth grades of the Dearborn School. The workshop introduced various reading methods and ways of relating these to the different subject areas and assisted teachers in developing curriculum materials. The following is a summary of responses on eight questionnaires.

Findings: At the beginning almost all of the teachers (7 out of 8) assumed that the workshop would cover techniques and methods in the teaching of reading and vocabulary development. Three of the eight wanted a review of innovative ways of teaching reading and vocabulary growth. One teacher emphasized the need to learn methods with high motivational content. A few of the new teachers also

desired to know what the EDC program had to offer in other areas, as well as in reading. One teacher was interested in discussing with other teachers their experiences in teaching language arts in the classroom and their teaching philosophies; another wanted to make educational materials.

Seven of the eight teachers felt the workshop met their expectations; but of these seven, three had qualifications. One teacher commented, "Partly because many students are merely turned off to anything academic and there seems to be no method yet discovered that will do the job." Another said she wanted more discussion with the other teachers and more time devoted to making materials like books and filmstrips.

The teachers were most interested in specific methods which would be useful to them in their classrooms. From this workshop, over 50 percent of them said they found new ways of introducing language and reading skills into their subject areas via books, films and photography, and that the use of word games was a very helpful technique. This was especially true when they adapted the games by using words relevant to their particular subject. They commented, "The games were very useful. I got lots of ideas from this." The teachers felt the resource books provided another source of ideas. Exchanging ideas and information with other teachers and EDC people

was another feature of the workshop which they reported also increased their pool of workable ideas.

All of the teachers used ideas or materials from the workshop in their classrooms and everyone used one of the approaches to vocabulary development. Of these approaches, fifty percent of them used the games and tailored them for use in their subject area. Others listed words relevant to the lesson on the board during class. Some used ideas from books or developed language arts through poetry or photography.

As for suggested changes in the workshop, several teachers mentioned wanting more attention given to developing ideas for use in special class situations. Many felt more time should have been devoted to generating materials--especially game materials--for use in their own classrooms. Two teachers also wanted planning units and objectives to be worked on with them. They seemed to feel the content of the workshop could have been improved by exchanging ideas with other people. They suggested a few ways of accomplishing this, such as more discussion with other teachers and additional consultants. One teacher explained: "One thing might be to bring in some outside people who may have had some good ideas that worked for them in situations." Teachers recom-

mended that more relevant topics could have been chosen, such as mythology and folk tales. As one teacher said, "Astrology is interesting but not helpful."

None of them wanted follow-up work in reading, but instead wanted specific help in developing curriculum materials like vocabulary games. One teacher requested personal classroom support instead of consultant help: "I have had help and support from EDC, especially from _____(team member). It has been very important in inspiring ideas, and in getting materials, in actual classroom help and also teacher support. I would be very grateful if this would continue." Other areas in which teachers wanted consultant help were science and audio-visual aids.

Although the teachers complained that the workshop did not give enough attention to developing curriculum materials, Dr. Curtis did not wholeheartedly agree. She was disappointed with teachers' efforts at developing curriculum ideas and characterized them as unenthusiastic and unreceptive. Her feelings were generally supported in the following statement by one of the teachers.

> My major reaction to the workshop in terms of its effectiveness or ineffectiveness is simply the time of day. It simply was not a time when teachers felt enthusiastic or "creative" about thinking up new things or even thinking at all very sharply. It was almost always the end of very difficult days for us and because we didn't get "turned on" to something, the responses to the workshop may have come off as blah.

But this teacher also felt they weren't entirely at fault, and explains her position.

> But I feel a good part of this responsibility for this rests upon the approach or presentations. Maybe an exchange of ideas between them and other people with useful workable approaches or with other kinds of expertise might serve to turn them on... Teaching in the Dearborn Annex is a <u>full time job</u>. My time is terribly precious to me and I must spend it on things and in ways that are clearly useful, meaningful and pertinent to what I do each day.

The reading workshop introduced teachers to new ways of improving students' reading skills via games, photography, and other means. It also exposed them to other potential sources of ideas like books and other teachers. However, the workshop could have been improved by providing more assistance in making and developing curriculum units.

B. The Learning Fair: A Student's View

On January 21 and 22, 1971 the Boston team organized a learning fair in the Washington Park Mall to make the community, especially parents, aware of EDC's program in the Dearborn. They felt that acquainting parents with the activities and equipment in the resource room would encourage them to come into the school. The learning fair also served to initiate the Annex students to the resource room which had just become ready for regular student use. Tables were

set up in different areas displaying a wide range of materials and equipment--from books to cameras and microscopes. This wasn't a fair for the passive observer. It was designed with the more adventurous student, parent, or passerby in mind, someone who would be willing to try his hand at playing math games or making a Mexican craft object called "God's eye" or any of the multitude of other activites. In interviews with 20 seventh and eighth graders the following questions were asked about the fair:

1. What did you do at the fair?
2. Did you learn anything?
3. What did you like best?
4. Why do you think the fair was given?
5. Did anyone ask you questions? If yes, how did you like people asking you questions?

The students' reactions indicate that all activities were tried at least once. Students got involved and felt they learned in the process. One student, bubbling with self-confidence, said: "I learned I could do things I never thought I could do before." Taking and developing pictures and making "God's eyes" attracted more students than any other activity. But others watched movies about the Eskimos, played math games, made radios, or looped an electrical circuit to ring a bell or light a bulb, read books,

painted pictures, made tables and chairs from Tri-wall, looked through microscopes or ran the old-fashioned steam engine.

Photography got the highest rating for the best-liked activity. Many students couldn't make up their minds--they liked "everything." One of them said, "I had so much fun, I don't know what I liked best." But more than the activities themselves, some students liked the freedom of choice and movement. One student explained, "I liked being able to go into something else once I was done instead of being stable in one place." "It was open," another commented, "you could do anything you wanted."

Students' views on why the fair was given fell into three categories. Some thought it served a public relations function--"to let the public see what we were doing in the resource room." Others thought it was meant to be a learning experience for the general public. "People could come and learn new things they didn't know before." A third group felt the purpose of the fair was to develop their skills and to bolster their self-confidence: "The resource team wanted to show us what we could do." "The fair was given to help kids." The objectives of the team embraced all that the students mentioned. One student, putting it all together, explained: "The fair was given for students to learn about new things they didn't know before and people to come around and watch and learn things they didn't know."

Being in the public eye does have its rewards. Asked how they liked being questioned by on-lookers, students said: "It made me feel like a teacher." "I liked it 'cause I knew I was part of it." "It made me feel good." "It made me feel important."

The fair exposed the students to new learning experiences. By becoming actively involed with the materials they gained confidence in their own ability and enjoyed themselves at the same time.

C. A Community Coordinated Drug Education Workshop

In trying to cope with the growing problem of drugs, two teachers at the Annex had been unofficially incorporating aspects of drug education in their curriculum. They asked for help in this effort from team members, who suggested having a drug education workshop for the Annex students and inviting ex-drug users to talk to them about their experiences. The team members felt students would be more apt to listen to someone who had actually used drugs.

The workshop was planned and organized using the resources of the nearby community center, the Roxbury Neighborhood House. EDC sponsored the workshop and staff people from Project Turnabout, a drug rehabilitation program, directed it.

The eighteen students, six teachers and a few parents who attended the workshop were split into two discussion groups with the teachers and parents in one group and the students in another. The Turnabout staff seemed unprepared to handle some of the questions and seemed inexperienced working with students in this age group. One of the leaders backed off from answering direct questions about how drugs were taken and told students that understanding why people took drugs was more important. The leader's reluctance to give explicit answers to some questions seemed to stem from one of the basic issues in drug education: Will drug education stop kids from experimenting with drugs? The leaders seemed to feel that telling students too much might encourage them to try drugs rather than discourage their use.

A question and answer session in which the Turnabout staff answered the students' questions ended the discussion period. The students asked the following questions: Why do people still make drugs? How do people start taking drugs? Where are some of the places you can get dope? Why did they start making dope? Where do the drugs come from? If you take all the drugs together, what will happen to you? If it messes up your system, why do doctors prescribe drugs? Why shouldn't you take drugs? What do you do to get a friend off drugs? What do you do if someone is trying to make you take drugs?

Following the discussion, several suggestions were made for follow-up of this workshop:*

1. To show movies about drugs
2. To visit the Turnabout House in Hull
3. To set up a display of drugs explaining what happens to you physically when you take drugs

---

*None of these suggestions were ever implemented.

V. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

A. Student Interviews

In May, 1971, interviews were given to 30 seventh and eighth graders (22 boys, 8 girls) from the Dearborn Annex on their activities in an EDC-sponsored resource room. They were randomly selected from approximately 50 students who regularly participated in the resource room.

They were asked the following questions:

1. How many times during the week do you go to the resource room or the design lab?

2. What workshops did you go to?

3. Why do you like going to the resource room?

4. Do you learn anything that helps you with your work in your other subjects?

   What?

   How?

5. If you could change how the resource room works, what would you change? Or what don't you like about how the resource room works?

Findings: The students liked going to the resource room because in their words: "There are things to do. . . reading, developing film, taking pictures." "There are a lot of exciting things to do. . . science, reading, and making things." They could read, develop film, take

pictures, make glass jewelry, put plastic models of the human body together, work with batteries and bulbs, do math with a tutor, experiment with the microscope or just get away from school. In a word, "It was fun." The most popular activity was photography. . . taking, developing, and enlarging pictures.

The resource room offered the students a change from their usual school routine. In their eyes it was quite different from the rest of the rooms in the school: "It's painted, has lots of books and plenty of things to do." "You can work on film, reading or sit quiet and learn."

All was not play though. Over half the students said they could apply what they did in the resource room to their regular school work. Photography was directly related to language arts and students did science units or, with the help of tutors, boned up on math and English. Some had gotten useful information from the many books in the room, including books on black history, African art, and even Spanish books. Math and science were areas most commonly worked on in the resource room. As one student pointed out: "We learn more about science. In other rooms they tell us about experiments, down here we get to do them ourselves." A few students said they most frequently worked on English, language arts, Spanish, history, goegraphy, and black history.

Most students went to the resource room once or twice a week. But if they could change things: "Everyone could come down, the room would be larger, and they could come down more often." There would be a

larger darkroom, more books and materials. But many students wouldn't change anything. They wanted to have more of the same equipment they used in the resource room: microscopes, biology and science materials, blackboards, cameras, film developers and electronic equipment.

The students liked the resource room for several reasons. Physically, it was a pleasant place to spend time. Even more important, a variety of activities intrigued them and the EDC people who worked with them were encouraging and created a warm atmosphere.

B. Teacher Interviews

In May, 1971, eighteen teachers from the Dearborn Annex, four school administrators and the resource coordinator were interviewed on their impressions of the EDC program. (See Appendix for the questions they were asked.)

Findings: The resource room became a vehicle for reaching teachers, parents, and students. One teacher summarized the total impact of the program as it was seen and enjoyed by most of the teachers: "I like the room itself, the layout, the materials and the extra projects the kids were working on."

In sharp contrast to the rest of the building the room was vibrant and inviting. Teachers commented: "They created a room which was a more

attractive, a more desirable, and a more exciting place to work." "They transformed that dreary basement into a bright and pleasant place and the room was so attractive that all the kids wanted to come down at once." Environment does affect and control attitudes and outlooks.

Another reason for the room's impact on the teachers was the very positive reaction of their students. What they saw happening to their students in the room was probably what they wanted in their own classrooms. One teacher said: "Some of the kids who had been totally disinterested in school found something they liked." Another teacher explains: "The kids are turned on down there because it relates to their needs."

But the teachers criticized the program because it did not coordinate and relate what went on in the resource room to the classroom. One teacher commented: "The room served an isolated purpose because it didn't extend into the other areas of the school." Several teachers felt one of the reasons for this was the lack of communication and rapport between the team and the teachers. Explained one teacher: "There was not a good working relationship between the team and the teachers, so we could show the kids that there is a tie-in between the resource room and the classroom." Another teacher commented: "There was a barely perceptible feeling that we were being silently criticized

by the EDC staff as rigid or as typically authoritarian Boston chool teachers." As a result of these negative feelings few teachers themselves fully utilized the room and those who visited regularly went primarily to see what the students were doing.

However, the resource room in another sense brought the team "closer" to the teachers. The resource coordinator explained: "There is an immediacy to a resource room where a teacher only has a few minutes. She can go in her own school and get materials; she doesn't have to wait three or four days for materials. I think this is one of its best services--immediacy."

To the teachers, one of the program's most valuable forms of assistance was the provision of materials. Two aspects of these materials impressed them. First, because the school system supplied teachers only with textbooks and general supplies, most of them saw EDC as a source of badly-needed materials. One teacher commented: "EDC brought materials into the school which were not in the school budget. They were probably one of the most important sources of materials." Secondly, other teachers liked the innovative aspects of the materials and their appeal to students and the community. The resource coordinator said: "The resource room has materials that are black-oriented. It is a service to the boys and girls and the community in terms of image. It also gives teachers who do not have materials on blackness available to them an important orientation for their classes."

Most of the teachers liked the activities or special projects for the students in the resource room. Again they stressed that these projects provided alternatives for the students that were lacking in the regular school program or could not be given in a regular classroom because of space and organizational limitations. Commented one teacher: "They attempted to establish a room where kids could explore on their own and do extra things, things they couldn't do in a regular classroom." The teachers also liked to see students follow small group or individual interests. "The teacher is unable to follow small interest groups in the regular classroom and the team, by following individual interest, took pressure away from the classroom."

A few teachers recognized that small group activities were not only providing students with new activites, but also helping them to change their attitudes about themselves and the school. They saw this as one of the team's major purposes. "They wanted to make kids aware of themselves and their surroundings, to motivate students to want to learn, and to improve the self-image of the students." Another example of this was the assistance the team gave the music teacher in helping the students put on a play, dance and fashion show to raise money for scholarships. One teacher commented that this was the first time students acted cooperatively as a group.

However, students in the resource room created a problem for the teachers because of the disorganized way the team handled the scheduling. Teachers complained they didn't know what was happening--they didn't know who was going there or when. One teacher said: "The kids were pulled from the classroom at different times. We never knew when the kids would be going down to the resource room and this made for disruption of the class." And the resource coordinator commented: "One of the drawbacks of this program was that there was an expectancy with EDC to have the school conform to its schedule, rather than EDC working through the school's schedule."

Seeing the team work in a laboratory setting with the students allowed the teachers to use them as a source of ideas. One teacher explained: "They acted more as a resource team this year by coordinating and acting as a source of ideas. . . the resource room helped to do this because it was a point from which to work." Teachers became attuned to the concepts of open education after seeing the team use them successfully in the resource room. The resource coordinator commented: "Student-oriented small group instruction is a more important role in education than the other types of orientations." One teacher said: "They implemented those ideas and concepts that students follow their own interest, that students should be self-directed. . . education has to change, learning has to be more individually-centered." Even the school administrators began to echo the same basic concepts of open

education. One said: "In the resource room, the kids can move around, make a class lesson less formal and still be educating."

The all-black composition of the team also had an impact on the teachers. For the first time the staff was all black, working primarily in a school whose students are about 98% black and whose teachers are almost all white. The team presented positive models of black people for the students. The school administrators commented: "Everyone liked the EDC staff, they were cooperative, generous and easy to get along with." "All the men presented a fine image which the kids don't have." "The principle feature of the program is that we had black people here who were educated and the kids could see it." "One thing that was very helpful was the people in the program." "_____ was just great." "_____ was very cooperative." "_____ helped with the play and it was an experience to get the kids to like the school." "This team is probably the best team you have had. This team was much more concerned, much more dependable as a team, not as individuals, but as a team than other years. . . also attitudes were healthier."

There were several recommendations, some very similar to the ones from the previous year's evaluation. Two teachers wanted more classroom support--demonstration teaching in the class, for example. "The team should have worked with the teachers in their classrooms. . . This gives me a chance to see a different approach used with the kids." One teacher requested that they get experienced teachers. . . "someone who knows the

teacher's mentality and the language that means something to teachers." One administrator wanted to see the community more involved in the resource room: "It would have been a good place for the community to use if it had been manned all the time."

Overall, the most common response among teachers and administrators was disappointment about the team's departure. Everyone felt another year would have seen the elimination of most of the bugs in the program. The resource coordinator commented: "I think one more year would have seen a tremendous change in the accomplishments because the EDC personnel were beginning to realize the problems and also our teachers were beginning to realize its potential."

C. Classroom Observations

As a pilot study of the program's impact, preliminary classroom observations were made in January, to determine if certain changes were occurring in EDC classrooms. Was the teacher attempting to use a more open style of teaching in her classroom? Did the teacher encourage small group activity? Was the learning process student oriented and open to experimentation? Was the teacher using innovative materials in her curriculum?

Methods: The sample for the classroom observation was divided into three different groups at two grade levels, elementary and junior high. The three groups were:

a. A target group (X), consisting of classrooms in the Dearborn school district, classrooms having contact with EDC personnel

b. A control group (C_1), classrooms in the same school district having no contact with EDC personnel this year

c. A second control group (C_2), classrooms in a school district where EDC people have not worked

Diagram of Number of Observations in Each Category

X	C_1	C_2
2	5	5
5		5

The total number of classrooms observed in the sample was 22. Three classrooms in the C_1 category had to be dropped because not enough teachers could be found who would agree to have their classrooms observed.

Procedure: Three observers were trained to use the observation schedule until some degree of reliability was obtained. Two observers were black and one was white.

Each classroom was observed twice, each time by a different observer. Care was taken to keep the identity of the treatment groups from the observers. Control classrooms were selected on the basis of having a similar student racial composition and economic status.

Findings:* Classroom observations focused upon three aspects of the classroom environment:

a. The physical set-up. There were more target classrooms with small group arrangements. Target classrooms also had more activity centers. The control classrooms usually had one or two activity centers while the target classes sometimes had three or four. In the junior high target classrooms, there were more bulletin boards, more pictures of blacks and more children's drawings displayed. The only difference in the content of the bulletin boards in the elementary schools was the experimental classes had more skill charts (Probably because of the contract reading program).

b. Classroom atmosphere. The teacher-student interaction section of this schedule was eliminated because observer reliability was so low. There was no difference in the experimental and control schools in teacher or student behavior. Teachers were fairly permissive and democratic, but they controlled most of the activities. Students didn't initiate topics often and sat quietly at their desks.

* For purposes of analysis, the two elementary control classrooms located in the experimental school districts were included as part of the experimental group because two classrooms were too small a number to be significant.

c. Materials. There was a greater range in the diversity of materials found in the target classrooms. They had Tri-wall, science equipment, audio-visual equipment and games.

TABLE 1

SCHOOL	GRADES SERVED	NO. OF STUDENTS	NO. OF TEACHERS	NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED	NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED
DEARBORN DISTRICT					
Palmer	K-1	200	6	4	67%
Annex	7-8	525	18	13	72%
Dearborn	K-6	200	30	15	50%
Sub-total		925	54	32	59%
CONTROL SCHOOLS					
Gibson	K-5	400	25	16	64%
Holmes	7-9	533	25	25	100%
Sub-total		933	50	41	82%
GRAND TOTAL		1858	104	73	

Control Comparability

Age. Table 3 presents figures showing that in both target and control schools, over fifty percent of the teachers fell into the 21-30 years old age range. In the elementary school the control school had a slightly larger percentage of teachers in this age range. About 80% of control teachers were 21-30 as compared to 60% in the target schools.

Sex. Both the target and control schools have similar male to female ratios. Table 2 shows that in the elementary schools, the male to female ratio was 1 to 9 and in the junior high schools it was 1 to 1 for both groups.

Present Position. In all schools, at least 65 percent of the teachers hold permanent positions. The target school teachers have a slightly greater number of teachers with permanent positions than the control group. Table 4 presents the actual frequencies by percent.

Teaching Time in the School. In both control and target schools at least 43 percent of the teachers had been teaching one to two years. At the elementary level, the control school had a greater number of teachers (57%) who had been teaching 3-4 years as compared

to 18 percent of the target group. But the target school had about 25 percent of the teachers who had taught more than 4 years compared to none in the control school. (Table 4 presents these results in detail.) At the junior high level the control had more teachers (74%) who had taught 1-2 years, compared to 46% of the target group.

Years Teaching. In Table 6 the data shows on the elementary level that 50% of the teachers had taught 1-2 years, while in the control school, about 60 percent had taught 3-4 years. On the junior high level both groups had large numbers of teachers (40%) who only had been teaching 1-2 years.

Subject Specialist. Table 8 presents figures showing that the elementary schools had few subject specialists. In both target and control groups at the junior high level over 65 percent of the teachers were subject specialists. The target school had a greater number of subject specialists than the control group.

Highest Degree Received. At the junior high level the target and control group had approximately the same percentage of teachers with bachelors degrees (about 70%) and masters degrees

(30%). In the elementary schools the target school had a larger number of teachers with a masters degree (about 40%) compared to 13% in the control schools.

Both groups were very similar. Teachers in all groups were young, inexperienced, and held permanent teaching positions.

D. Teacher Questionnaire

In May 1971, questionnaires were distributed to teachers in the Dearborn school district and to teachers in the control schools of the Gibson and Holmes. Teachers were given a few days to complete the questionnaire and then they were picked up by two research assistants. In the Dearborn district, 59% of the teachers completed the questionnaire, and in the control districts, 82% of the teachers filled in the questionnaires, 100% at the Holmes and 64% at the Gibson. Table 1 contains the complete distributions.

The questionnaire contained questions covering:

a. Contact with EDC

b. Views of EDC people

c. Sources of new ideas

d. Materials

e. Ideal classroom

f. Background information

The questionnaires given to the teachers in the control district did not contain two of these sections--Views of EDC People and Materials.

Findings:

a. Contact With EDC. Teachers were asked to indicate the nature and frequency of their contacts with EDC including individual contact as well as those in workshops. The frequency of contact was coded as follows for each of seven types of contacts:

1. never
2. once
3. 2-4 times
4. 5-7 times
5. 8 or more times

The types of contacts were:

1. general instructional help
2. suggestions on teaching methods and techniques
3. curriculum materials
4. advice and classroom interaction
5. demonstration teaching
6. advice in classroom organization
7. classroom follow-up

The control school was given the same question and asked to indicate the number of contacts they had with outside people for the same period, 1970-71.

In the experimental school district, the teachers reported having contact with EDC most frequently for 1) curriculum materials and supplies, 2) teaching methods, and 3) instructional help, in that order. They had less contact for support in areas such as classroom organization, classroom follow-up and demonstration teaching. The control schools reported little or no contact with outside people. And in the few cases where this did occur, it was for instructional help, classroom materials and classroom interaction. Tables 10-18 present the exact frequencies.

Within the experimental district, when one compares the junior high and the elementary schools, the junior high teachers reported having more frequent contact with EDC people. 91% of the junior high teachers had contact with EDC as opposed to only 65% of the elementary teachers.

b. <u>View of EDC people.</u> Teachers were asked to rate the team on a five-point semantic differential scale. The items for the scale were taken from teacher interviews in the 1969-1970 evaluation.

The following items were included on the scale:

relevant/irrelevant

self-centered/teacher-centered

many new ideas/no new ideas

no new materials/much new materials

unreliable/reliable

familiar with school problems/unfamiliar with school problems

familiar with teaching pressures/unfamiliar with teaching pressures

supportive/not supportive

disorganized/organized

critical/uncritical

Within the experimental district, the junior high and elementary teachers varied considerably on their perceptions of the EDC team. The junior high teachers saw the team as being relevant, having many new ideas and materials, familiar with teaching problems and school pressures, and supportive. In contrast, the elementary teachers saw them as irrelevant, self-centered, having few new ideas, unreliable and disorganized. Both groups criticized the team as being self-centered. Tables 19 and 20 present the percentages for each scale item.

The other section of the questionnaire concerned teachers' view of their experiences with EDC. They were asked about whether the time and attention they received was adequate, whether they could teach other teachers what they had learned, whether their experience this year had been more satisfactory than in the past, and whether they felt the team had changed the Dearborn.

The junior high teachers were again more favorably disposed toward the team. They felt they received enough time and attention from the team, they could teach other teachers what they had learned, and their experience with the team had been more satisfactory than in past years.

In contrast, the elementary teachers felt they hadn't received enough time and attention from the team and felt their experience with the team this year had been less satisfactory. These findings are presented in Tables 21-32.

c. Materials. Teachers were provided a checklist of materials and asked to indicate what materials they ordered, received, used and found effective. In the elementary schools, 62% of the materials ordered were received and all of them were used, but only 50% of those used were reported effective. Whereas, the junior high teachers received 89% of the materials ordered, used 80% of them and reported 90% of the materials used as being effective. The figures are in Table 33.

d. Sources of new ideas. Both experimental and control groups mentioned these four sources for ideas:

1. Self
2. Other teachers
3. Professional reading
4. Local workshops

Tables 34 and 35 contain the percentages for all sources.

In this section teachers were also asked their views on innovation. Teachers were presented two statements about innovation and asked if they agree; strongly agree; disagree; or strongly disagree.

All the teachers in both experimental and control schools felt that outside people were important for innovation. However, all felt that a teacher's perception of a need for change was a better indicator than the opinions of outsiders. Tables 36 to 39 present these findings.

e. Ideal classroom. In this section a five point semantic differential scale was used, containing ten paired scale items. Teachers checked those scale items that most closely approximated their views on how a classroom should be run.

Both the experimental and the control schools were very closely matched in their views of the ideal classroom. But the experimental school teachers were slightly more disposed to an "open" classroom teaching style. There was only one item where they differed significantly from the control schools and that was the scale item concerning the emphasis on exploration and experimentation versus the mastery of facts. Tables 40 and 41 present the percentages for each scale item.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Formative evaluation recorded a shift in the team's focus. This year the program was directed primarily at the students and only secondarily at teachers. There was also an increasing commitment to bringing parents into the schools. The team's work with students was very successful. Not only did the materials and extra projects arouse the students' interest and desire for creative exploration, but the content of the program proved relevant to their needs. Furthermore, the presence of capable, black team members in the school provided positive adult models with which the students could identify and emulate.

It is more difficult to assess the impact of this program on the school as a whole or on the community. In this school, the resource room represented a vital model of a new way education could be conducted. Most teachers had obtained innovative materials and equipment from the resource room. But only a few actually changed the structure of their classrooms or their basic approach to teaching.

As for the community, some parents had seen glimpses of new approaches to education, new activities and materials. Whether

this kind of exposure had significantly changed what they felt they could ask from schools remains to be seen.

This room and other EDC projects were an important influence on the school while they continued. But there is little indication that the school will utilize the room or continue its activities in the same manner now that the team had departed.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS OF READING WORKSHOP

1. What did you expect to accomplish in this workshop?

Responses	Number of Responses
a. Methods and techniques for teaching reading and vocabulary	7
b. Discussion with other teachers	1
c. Review of innovative ways of teaching reading and vocabulary	3
d. Making educational materials	1
e. To learn what EDC offers	2

2. Were your expectations met?

Yes	4
Yes and No	3
No	1

Why not?

1. Talk more with other teachers
2. Make more materials like books and filmstrips
3. Haven't found method yet that keeps students' attention

3. List the four things which you found most helpful in this workshop.

Use of games (reading games, pokeno)	4
Approaches to vocabulary development	2
Teacher resource books and previewing student books	5
Discussions with other teachers	1
Suggestions for making materials, e.g. books, filmstrips	1
Informal atmosphere	1
Not too long	1

New ways of introducing language/reading skills into my subject, i.e., books, films, ideas, photography	4
Familiarity with the resource room and how it could be used	1
Getting together with teachers and EDC people to become familiar with projects and ideas	3
Opportunity to develop ideas	1
Word sounds	1
Organized plans	1

4. List the four things which you found least helpful?

Laissez faire, undirected approach	1
Played games too much	2
Astrology	1
Not enough motivational content in technique	1
Phonics lessons	2
More help in developing materials for class	1
Vocabulary list	1
Workshops spaced too closely	1
No response	2

5. Did you use any of the ideas in your classroom?

Yes	8
No	0

5a. What ideas or materials did you use?

Vocabulary ideas:	8
- Listing vocabulary before giving any assignment	1
- Using vocabulary games especially adapted to their particular subject area	4
- Pokeno	2

Listing words on blackboard relevant to lesson or activity	2
Use of books introduced in workshop for ideas	2
Review of reading skills	1
Approach to poetry	1
Photography to induce language	1

6. If the workshop were to be given again, what changes would you make?

None	2
Developing materials for use in class	3
Actually planning units to be taught	2
More direction	1
Making games rather than playing them	2
More information on mythology and folktales rather than astrology	1
Exchange of ideas between teachers	1
Outside consultants	1

7. Do you want follow-up consultant help in reading this year?

Yes	
No	8

7a. In what area did you want help?

Science	1
Visual Aids	2
Photography	1
Language arts ("develop vocal games for classroom, puppets.")	2

8. List your reasons for attending this workshop in order of importance.

First choices:

- Learn other methods of teaching reading 5

- Money 1

- Cooperate with EDC with developing more consciousness to reading needs of kids 3

Second choices:

- Learn about innovative methods in vocabulary development and reading 2

- To get materials and ideas 2

- To learn more about EDC and their function in the school 1

- To find out how other teachers teach reading 1

Third (or more) choice:

- New ways of presenting material

- Contact with new materials 1

- Find out about EDC program 1

- To develop and get new materials

- Money

- To talk about other educational philosophies with Dearborn teachers 1

TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. Have you had nay contact with the EDC people this year?

2. What do you think the EDC people were trying to do this year in your school?

3. What did you like about the EDC team's work in your school this year?

4. What didn't you like?

5. Do you think there is a need for your school having a resource room?

6. Why or why not?

7. How often have you visited the resource room in the Dearborn Annex?

8. For what reasons?

9. Have you used any of the ideas or materials which you observed in the resource room? If no, why not?

10. Which ideas or materials have you found useful?

11. How often have you used these ideas or materials in your classroom?

12. Have your students used any of the ideas or materials?

13. Do you feel the EDC resource room fulfills a valuable function in your school?

14. Why or why not?

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

School_____ Room #_____ Grade_____

Date_____ Observer _____

Length of observation_____

I. PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

1. Are the desks movable?

____Y ____N

2. How are the desks arranged?

____rows/columns
____small groups (describe grouping)
____other (describe)

3. How many bulletin boards are there?

____none
____1-2
____3-4
____4 or more

4. Content of the bulletin boards

Code: (a) = none (b) = 1-4 items (c) = 5-8 items
(d) = 8 or more items (e) = can't tell

Place appropriate code letter in the reserved space.

____ picture or posters of Blacks
____ other pictures or posters
____ children's drawings (art work, murals)
____ graded papers
____ photographs taken by students/ or of students
____ skill charts (reading, math, alphabet)
____ student's writing (ungraded)
____ experience charts
____ other (specify) _____

5. How many activity centers were there?

____ none
____ 1-2
____ 3-4
____ 4 or more

6. Check if evidence of the following activities:

____ independent art projects
____ library center or reading table
____ science center
____ other

Comment or describe:

II. CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES AND STRUCTURE

7. Adults present in classroom

Check appropriate ones.

____ regular teacher
____ substitute teacher
____ special staff (who) _____
____ teacher aide
____ other (specify)

8. Total number of adults _____

9. Total number of students _____

10. Classroom activity(ies) observed

____ reading-text
____ reading-other
____ writing
____ spelling
____ phonics
____ story-telling
____ creative writing
____ math
____ social studies
____ science
____ music
____ art
____ other (specify)

11. Time sequence of activities

____ some simultaneous
____ one activity at a time

12. Approximate number of children in the teaching unit _____

If less than the entire class, what were the other children doing?

_____

13. What was the objective of the lesson or activity?

14. Use of teaching aids

____ A-V equipment (specify, comment)
____ blackboard (by students or teacher)
____ pupil prepared materials
____ teacher prepared materials
____ use of pictures, posters
____ reading material
____ games (specify) _____
____ other (specify) _____

III. CLASSROOM ATMOSPHERE

A. Teacher-Student interaction

In a 15-minute time sample to be taken at the beginning of the observation, tally the number of times a specific interaction occurs.

TEACHER	STUDENT
15. Lecture (directive style)_____	25. Student statements or questions_____
16. ____ Procedural_____	26. ____ Procedural_____
17. ____ Factual (definitional)_____	27. ____ Factual _____
18. ____ Personal (extending concepts through interest_____	28. ____ Personal_____
19 ____ Irrelevant_____	29. ____ Irrelevant_____
20. Inquiry (guided discussion)_____	30. Student response_____
21. ____ Procedural_____	31. ____ Procedural_____
22. ____ Factual _____	32. ____ Factual _____
23. ____ Personal _____	33. ____ Personal _____
24. ____ Irrelevant _____	34. ____ Irrelevant_____
	35. Total number of students responding _____

Remarks:

B. Children's behavior (consider session in general)

36.	Student interest and enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Student interest
		Low						High	
37.	Students initiate topics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Students don't initiate topics
38.	All students volunteered in response to questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	No students volunteered
39.	Nature of classroom participation								
	Active (Manipulating things, direct experience)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Passive (intake of facts, information)
40.	Noise level very quiet	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Noisy, hectic
41.	Movement (children sitting working at desks)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	(Children freely moving about the room)
42.	Student to student exchange (related to subject matter)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
		Low						High	

C. Teacher Behavior (consider session in general)

43.	Teacher is authoritarian	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Permissive
44.	Teacher is reserved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expressive
45.	Teacher does not show pleasure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Shows pleasure
46.	Teacher does not show anger, is calm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Shows anger (loses temper easily)

47.	Teacher ill-at-ease	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relaxed, enjoys lesson
48.	Teacher is uninvolved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Involved with subject (enthusiastic)
49.	Teacher does not draw out students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Draws out students
50.	Teacher talks down to students much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	None
51.	Class is teacher-dominated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Class is student-dominated
52.	Teacher's style idea-oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	People-oriented
53.	Teacher's stance: apart from students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Physically close to students
54.	Teacher is dictatorial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Teacher is democratic

IV. MATERIALS (frequency of)

Place appropriate code letter in the reserved space.

Code	No. of items
a	None
b	1-3 items
c	4-7 items
d	8 or more items
e	can't tell/ not applicable

55. ____ Basic supplies (scissors, pens, etc.)

56. ____ Tri-wall (cardboard carpentry)

57. ____ Art or craft kits and supplies

58. ____ Science equipment (balance sets, Frostig papers, batteries and bulbs, electronic sets)

59. ____ Math equipment (Cuisenaire rods, Attribute Blocks, etc.)

____ Math games

60. ____ Photographic equipment

____ Cameras ____ Enlarger, printboxes

____ Supplies

61. ____ A-V equipment

____ Tape recorder ____ Tapes

____ Record player, records ____ Overhead projector

____ Film projector ____ Films

62. ____ Games

____ Word games ____ Puzzles

____ Strategy games (checkers) ____ Other (specify)

63. ____ Books

____ Student-made texts ____ Text ____ Non-text

64. ____ Living things

____ Animals (fish, gerbils, birds) ____ Plants

____ Supplies for their care and/or feeding

OPINIONNAIRE

EDC Pilot Communities Project

Spring 1971

Dear teacher:

We are currently concerned with evaluating the EDC program in your school and need your help in this effort. Your candid response to questions in this opinionnaire will be most useful in assessing this program. Background information has also been requested, but the forms will remain anonymous.

Please answer all questions. Incomplete forms will seriously decrease the value of the data.

A member of the research team will collect the form directly from you. He will check it with you at that time for completeness.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedules to answer this questionnaire. We greatly appreciate your willingness to help us with this study.

I. Contact with EDC Resource Team

1. How frequently during the school year have you received the following services from EDC people as an individual in your classroom or as a member of a group at a workshop? Please circle the appropriate number.

	Never	Once	2-4 Times	5-7 Times	8 or more Times
a. General instructional help in your classroom	1	2	3	4	5
b. Advice and suggestions about specific teaching methods and techniques	1	2	3	4	5
c. Curriculum materials, supplies, etc. provided in support of your teaching	1	2	3	4	5
d. Advice or assistance with classroom interaction, such as teacher-pupil, pupil-pupil	1	2	3	4	5
e. Demonstration teaching in your classroom	1	2	3	4	5
f. Advice on overall classroom organization, such as scheduling, seating, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Specific classroom follow-up after workshops	1	2	3	4	5
h. Other (specify--) _____ _____	1	2	3	4	5

2. Do you feel you have received more help as part of a workshop or individually (in the classroom or other)?

_____ at workshops _____ individually _____ doesn't apply

3. Are you able to utilize what you have learned from EDC in your classroom?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ doesn't apply

Explain:

4. Did you receive as much time and attention as you wanted from the EDC Resource Team?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ doesn't apply

What would you have liked? Explain:

5. Do you feel you could teach other teachers what you have learned with EDC materials, units or ideas?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ doesn't apply

Explain:

II. Your View of the EDC Resource Team

6. How do you see the Resource Team? Please check the appropriate blank in the continuum.

Relevant	___	___	___	___	___	Irrelevant
Self-centered	___	___	___	___	___	Teacher-centered
Many new ideas	___	___	___	___	___	No new ideas
No new material	___	___	___	___	___	Much new material
Unreliable	___	___	___	___	___	Reliable
Familiar with school problems	___	___	___	___	___	Unaware of school problems
Familiar with teaching pressures	___	___	___	___	___	Unaware of teaching pressures

Supportive	___	___	___	___	___	Not supportive
Disorganized	___	___	___	___	___	Organized
Critical	___	___	___	___	___	Uncritical

7. Compared with your experience last year, how would you describe your experience with the team this year?

_____ more satisfactory

_____ about the same

_____ less satisfactory (please explain why) _____

_____ does not apply

8. Do you feel the EDC team has brought about changes in the Dearborn?

_____ Yes _____ No (If Yes, what changes?) _____

_____

III. Sources of New Ideas

9. What has been your main source of ideas for innovations in the classroom this year?

_____ College courses

_____ Professional reading

_____ Consultants from outside the system

_____ National Professional Conventions

_____ State or regional conferences

_____ Local workshops

_____ Central office

_____ Principal/Assistant Principal

_____ Parents

_____ Community groups other than parents

_____ Other teachers

_____ Students

_____ Self

_____ Other (specify) _____

_____

10. It is important to have outside people to promote innovation in the classroom.

_____ Strongly agree _____ Agree

_____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree

11. Teacher perception of her class needs is a better gauge for change than opinions of outside experts.

_____ Strongly agree _____ Agree

_____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree

IV. Materials by Categories

Check the appropriate columns.

12. Did not order anything. _____

	Ordered		Received		Used		Effective	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
13. Basic supplies (scissors, pens, etc.)								
14. Tri-wall (cardboard carpentry)								
15. Games								
Word games								
Math games								
Strategy games (checkers, tictactoe)								
Other games (specify)								
16. Art &/or craft kits and supplies								
17. Science kits								
18. Math equipment (cuisenaire rods, calculators, etc.)								
19. Books								
20. Puzzles								

	Ordered		Received		Used		Effective	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
21. Records								
22. Tapes								
23. A.V. Films & Film Strips								
24. "Kids, Cameras, & Communities" ("Little Camera")								
25. Photography equipment & supplies (enlarger, print box, polaroid cameras)								
26. A.V. equipment (projector, tape recorders)								

V. Ideal Classroom

Using the following paired items, how do you envision your classroom functioning ideally?

The numbers between each pair of items represent a continuum. If you strongly agree with the statement to the left side of the page, circle a 1 or 2. If the statement on the right is more to your liking, circle a 4 or a 5. If you feel that neither extreme is appropriate all the time, circle a 3.

27.	Teacher is directive	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher is non-directive
28.	Students sit quietly	1	2	3	4	5	Students move about freely
29.	Desks are moved about according to activity	1	2	3	4	5	Desks are kept in rows
30.	Students teach each other	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher teaches class
31.	Students work individually or in small groups	1	2	3	4	5	Whole class covers subject together
32.	Emphasis is on exploration & experimentation	1	2	3	4	5	Emphasis is on mastery of facts
33.	Curriculum is textbook-oriented	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher develops her own curriculum
34.	Individuals are free to move in & out of room	1	2	3	4	5	All activities are centered in the classroom
35.	Students determine goals of learning	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher determines goals of learning
36.	Students determine learning activities	1	2	3	4	5	Teacher determines learning activities

VI. Background Information

37. School _____ Grade _____

38. Years teaching _____

39. Present position:

_____ Permanent _____ Probationary _____ Temporary

40. If subject specialist, please specify: _____

41. How long have you taught in this school? _____

42. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

43. Age:
a) 20 or under _____ d) 41-50 _____

b) 21-30 _____ e) 51-60 _____

c) 31-40 _____

44. Highest diploma or degree:

High School _____ Associate Degree _____

Bachelor _____ Master _____ Doctor _____

TABLES 2 - 40

TABLE 2

SEX

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13* %	Palmer n=11 %	Gibson n=4 %	Annex n=24 %	Holmes n=16 %
Male	23.1	0	12.5	45.5	50.0
Female	76.9	100.0	87.5	54.5	50.0

TABLE 3

AGE

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=23 %
21-30 years	69.2	50.0	81.3	72.7	65.2
31-40 "	30.8	50.0	12.5	9.1	13.0
41-50 "	0	0	6.3	18.2	8.7
51-60 "	0	0	0	0	13.0

*NOTE: All percentages in these tables are adjusted percentages. They are calculated using the number of respondents actually completing the question. But the n shown represents the total number of possible respondents. In some cases, the number of respondents actually completing the question is shown. This is indicated by n=total # of possible respondents/# of respondents completing the item.

TABLE 4

PRESENT POSITION

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=24 %
Permanent	76.9	100.0	81.3	81.8	66.7
Provisional	15.4	0	12.5	18.2	25.0
Temporary	7.7	0	6.3	0	8.3

TABLE 5

TEACHING TIME IN THIS SCHOOL

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=11 %	Palmer n=11 %	Gibson n=4 %	Annex n=23 %	Holmes n=14 %
1-2 years	54.6	100.0	42.9	45.5	73.9
3-4 years	18.2		57.1	18.2	4.3
5-6 years	18.2			36.4	8.6
7-8 years	9.1				4.3
12 years					4.3
15 years					4.3

TABLE 6

LENGTH OF TIME TEACHING

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=11 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=15 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=23 %
1-2 years	45.5	50.0	6.7	36.4	43.4
3-4 years	18.2	25.0	60.0	18.2	17.4
5-6 years	27.3		26.7	27.3	13.0
7-8 years			6.7	9.1	4.3
9-10 years	9.1				4.3
11+ years					4.3

TABLE 7

HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=24 %
Bachelor's	69.2	50.0	87.5	72.7	70.8
Master's	30.8	50.0	12.5	27.3	29.2

TABLE 8

SUBJECT SPECIALIST

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=12 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=24 %
Yes	8.3	25.0	25.0	90.9	66.7
No	91.7	75.0	75.0	9.1	33.3

TABLE 9

TEACHING GRADE

Grades	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	n=12 Dearborn %	n=3 Palmer %	n=16 Gibson %	n=11 Annex %	n=24 Holmes %
1	0	75	40		
2	25		10		
3	25		10		
4	12.5		20		
5	25.0		20		
6	12.5				
7	0			36.4	25
8	0			63.6	15
9	0				60

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH EDC

	Experimental n=31		Control n=42	
	Never %	At least once %	Never %	At least once %
Instructional help	54.8	45.2	97.6	2.4
Teaching methods	51.6	48.4	100.0	0
Curriculum materials	25.8	74.2	97.6	2.4
Classroom interaction	64.5	35.5	97.6	2.4
Demonstration teaching	71.0	29.0	100.0	0
Classroom organizing	93.5	6.5	100.0	0
Classroom follow-up	80.6	19.4	100.0	0

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH EDC

	Elementary				Junior High			
	Experimental n=20		Control n=17		Experimental n=11		Control n=25	
	Never %	At least once %	Never %	At least once %	Never %	At least once %	Never %	At least once %
Instructional Help	60.0	40.0	94.1	5.9	45.5	54.4	100.0	0
Teaching methods	65.0	35.0	100.0	0	27.3	72.7	100.0	0
Curriculum materials	35.0	65.0	100.0	0	9.1	90.9	96.0	4.0
Classroom interaction	75.0	25.0	100.0	0	45.5	54.5	96.0	4.0
Demonstration teaching	70.0	30.0	100.0	0	72.7	27.3	100.0	0
Classroom organization	90.0	10.0	100.0	0	100.0	0	100.0	0
Classroom follow-up	80.0	20.0	100.0	0	81.8	18.2	100.0	0

TABLE 12

INSTRUCTIONAL HELP

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	69.2	50.0	93.8	36.4	100.0
Once	7.7	0	6.3	9.1	0
2-4 times	7.7	0	0	0	0
5-7 times	7.7	50.0	0	36.4	0
8 or more	7.7	0	0	18.2	0

TABLE 13

TEACHING METHODS

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	76.9	50.0	50.0	18.2	100.0
Once	7.7	0	0	9.1	0
2-4 times	0	25.0	25.0	36.4	0
5-7 times	7.7	25.0	25.0	9.1	0
8 or more times	7.7	0	0	27.3	0

TABLE 14

CURRICULUM MATERIALS

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	46.2	50.0	100.0	0	96.0
Once	23.1	25.0	0	18.2	0
2-4 times	15.4	25.0	0	27.3	0
5-7 times	0	0	0	9.1	0
8 or more times	15.4	0	0	45.4	4.0

TABLE 15

CLASSROOM INTERACTION

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	76.9	50.0	100.0	45.5	96.0
Once	15.4	0	0	18.2	0
2-4 times	0	25.0	0	9.1	0
5-7 times	0	25.0	0	18.2	0
8 or more times	7.7	0	0	9.1	4.0

TABLE 16

DEMONSTRATION TEACHING

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	76.9	50.0	100.0	72.7	100.0
Once	15.4	0	0	9.1	0
2-4 times	0	25.0	0	9.1	0
5-7 times	0	25.0	0	0	0
8 or more times	7.7	0	0	9.1	0

TABLE 17

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	92.8	100.0	100.0	90.9	100.0
Once	0	0	0	9.1	0
2-4 times	0	0	0	0	0
5-7 times	0	0	0	0	0
8 or more times	7.7	0	0	0	0

TABLE 18

CLASSROOM FOLLOW-UP

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
Never	76.9	75.0	100.0	81.8	100.0
Once	7.7	25.0	0	0	0
2-4 times	0	0	0	9.1	0
5-7 times	0	0	0	9.1	0
8 or more times	15.4	0	0	0	0

TABLE 19

VIEW OF EDC

	Elementary n=20 %*	Junior High n=11 %* Adjusted
1. Relevant/irrelevant	35.7 - 42.8	90.0 - 0
2. Self-centered/teacher-centered	53.3 - 0	50.0 - 20.0
3. Many new ideas/no new ideas	23.1 - 30.8	50.0 - 0
4. No new material/much new material	23.1 - 30.8	0 - 80.0
5. Unreliable/reliable	86.6 - 6.7	30.0 - 30.0
6. Familiar with school problems/unfamiliar	53.9 - 32.1	70.0 - 10.0
7. Familiar with teaching pressures/ unfamiliar	38.5 - 30.8	50.0 - 40.0
8. Supportive/unsupportive	46.7 - 33.3	60.0 - 20.0
9. Disorganized/organized	53.4 - 20.0	30.0 - 40.0
10. Critical/uncritical	21.4 - 50.0	70.0 - 10.0

* % response on a 5 point semantic differential with neutral 3 answer omitted.

TABLE 20

VIEW OF EDC

	Elementary		Junior High
	Dearborn n=9 %	Palmer n=1 %	Annex n=11 %
1. Relevant--irrelevant	22.2 - 55.5	100 - 0	81.9 - 0
2. Self-centered--teacher-centered	55.5 - 0	0 - 0	54.6 - 18.2
3. Many new ideas/no new ideas	11.0 - 44.4	100 - 0	54.6 - 0
4. No new materials/much new materials	33.3 - 22 2	0 - 100	0 - 62.7
5. Unreliable/reliable	77.8 - 11.1	100 - 0	36.4 - 27.3
6. Familiar with school problems/ unfamiliar	33.3 - 33.3	100 - 0	72.7 - 9.1
7. Familiar with teaching pressures/ unfamiliar	22.2 - 44 4	100 - 0	45.5 - 36.4
8. Supportive/unsupportive	44.4 - 44 4	100 - 0	54.6 - 27.3
9. Disorganized/organized	44.4 - 33.3	0 - 0	36.4 - 36.4
10. Critical/uncritical	30.0 - 50.0	0 - 100	63.7 - 9.1

TABLE 21

COULD TEACH OTHER TEACHERS

	Elementary n=20 %	Jr. High n=11 %
Yes	35.3	50.0
No	23.5	20.0
Doesn't apply	41.2	30.0

TABLE 22

COULD TEACH OTHER TEACHERS

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=12 %	Palmer n=2 %	Annex n=10 %
Yes	25.0	100.0	50.0
No	25.0	0	20.0
Doesn't apply	50.0	0	30.0

TABLE 23

HAS EDC CHANGED THE DEARBORN

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=5 %	Palmer n=1 %	Annex n=10 %
Yes	40.0	100.0	90.0
No	60.0	0	10.0

TABLE 24

HAS EDC CHANGED THE DEARBORN

	Elementary n=20 %	Jr. High n=11 %
Yes	50.0	88.9
No	50.0	11.1

TABLE 25

RECEIVED ENOUGH TIME FROM EDC

	Elementary n=20 %	Junior High n=11 %
Yes	11.1	50.0
No	55.6	40.0
Doesn't apply	33.3	10.0

TABLE 26

RECEIVED ENOUGH TIME FROM EDC

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=11 %	Palmer n=2 %	Annex n=11 %
Yes	18.2	0	45.5
No	36.4	100.0	45.5
Doesn't apply	45.5	0	9.1

TABLE 27

COMPARATIVE EXPERIENCE WITH EDC TEAM

	Elementary n=20 %	Jr. High n=11 %
More satisfactory	5.6	50.0
About same	11.1	20.0
Less satisfactory	38.9	0
Doesn't apply	44.4	30.0

TABLE 28

COMPARATIVE EXPERIENCE WITH EDC TEAM

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=11 %	Palmer n=3 %	Annex n=11 %
More satisfactory	0	33.3	45.5
About same	18.2	0	18.2
Less satisfactory	45.5	33.3	0
Doesn't apply	36.4	33.3	36.4

TABLE 29

ABLE TO USE IDEAS FROM EDC IN CLASSROOM

	Elementary n=20 %	Jr. High n=11 %
Yes	31.6	62.5
No	15.8	25.0
Doesn't apply	52.6	12.5

TABLE 30

ABLE TO USE IDEAS FROM EDC IN CLASSROOM

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=12 %	Palmer n=2 %	Annex n=9 %
Yes	25.0	100.0	55.6
No	16.7	0	22.2
Doesn't apply	58.3	0	22.2

TABLE 31

MORE HELP GIVEN

	Elementary n=20 %	Jr. High n=11 %
Workshops	17.6	44.4
Individually	23.5	44.4
Doesn't apply	58.5	11.1

TABLE 32

MORE HELP GIVEN

	Elementary		Jr. High
	Dearborn n=11 %	Palmer n=1 %	Annex n=10 %
Workshops	9.1	0	50.0
Individually	27.3	100.0	40.0
Doesn't apply	63.6	0	10.0

TABLE 33

MATERIALS

	Elementary n=20								Junior High n=11							
	Ordered		Received		Used		Effective		Ordered		Received		Used		Effective	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Basic supplies	5	25.0	2	40.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tri-wall	5	25.0	3	60.0	3	100.0	2	100.0	5	45.5	5	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0
Games	6	30.0	4	66.7	4	100.0	1	25.0	5	45.5	3	60.0	2	66.7	2	100.0
Arts and crafts kits & supplies	3	15.0	2	66.7	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	18.2	2	100.0	1	50.0	1	100.0
Science kits	4	20.0	3	75.0	3	100.0	2	66.7	3	27.3	3	100.0	2	66.7	2	100.0
Math equipment	5	25.0	4	80.0	4	100.0	3	75.0	2	18.2	2	100.0	1	50.0	1	100.0
Books	4	20.0	2	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	6	54.6	6	100.0	5	80.0	4	80.0
Puzzles	4	20.0	2	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	1	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Records	1	5.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0	3	27.3	3	100.0	2	66.7	2	100.0
Tapes	2	10.0	1	50.0	1	100.0	0	0	1	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Films & film strips	2	10.0	1	50.0	1	100.0	0	0	5	45.5	4	80.0	4	100.0	2	50.0
Kids, Cameras, Comm.	2	10.0	1	50.0	1	100.0	0	0	3	27.3	3	100.0	2	66.7	2	100.0
Photo equipment	3	15.0	2	66.7	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	18.2	2	100.0	1	50.0	1	100.0
Audio-visual equipment	4	20.0	3	75.0	3	100.0	1	33.3	3	27.3	3	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0
Totals	50		31	62%	31	100%	15	50%	41		36	87.7%	28	77.7%	25	89.3%

TABLE 34

SOURCES OF NEW IDEAS

	Experimental n=31 %	Control n=42 %
Students	35.5	28.6
Other teachers	48.4	57.1
Community groups	3.2	4.8
Parents	16.1	9.5
Principal	12.9	9.5
Central office	0	2.4
Local workshops	38.7	23.8
State or regional conferences	3.2	4.8
National professional convention	3.2	4.8
Outside consultants	19.4	4.8
College courses	25.8	33.3
Professional reading	48.4	57.1

TABLE 35

SOURCES OF NEW IDEAS

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=13 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=11 %	Holmes n=25 %
College courses	23.1	0	18.8	36.4	44.0
Professional reading	46.2	25.0	43.8	54.5	68.0
Consultants from outside the system	7.7	25.0	6.3	27.3	4.0
National professional conventions	0	0	0	0	8.0
State or regional conference	0	0	0	9.1	8.0
Local workshops	30.8	50.0	50.0	36.4	12.0
Central office	0	0	6.3	0	0
Principal	0	25.0	12.5	18.2	8.0
Parents	15.4	25.0	18.8	18.2	4.0
Community groups other than parents	0	25.0	12.5	0	0
Other teachers	38.5	25.0	68.8	63.6	52.0
Students	30.8	25.0	43.8	54.5	20.0
Self	61.5	75.0	75.0	72.7	72.0

TABLE 36

OUTSIDE PEOPLE IMPORTANT FOR INNOVATION

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=12 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=16 %	Annex n=10 %	Holmes n=25 %
Agree*	91.7	100.0	81.3	80.0	52.0
Disagree	8.3	0	18.8	20.0	48.0

TABLE 37

OUTSIDE PEOPLE IMPORTANT FOR INNOVATION

	Experimental n=31/29 %	Control n=42 %
Agree	86.2	66.7
Disagree	13.8	33.3

TABLE 38

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS BETTER GAUGE FOR CHANGE

	Elementary			Junior High	
	Experim.		Control	Experim.	Control
	Dearborn n=10 %	Palmer n=4 %	Gibson n=14 %	Annex n=7 %	Holmes n=25 %
Agree	90.0	100.0	92.9	85.8	84.0
Disagree	10.0	0	7.1	14.3	16.0

TABLE 39

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS BETTER GAUGE FOR CHANGE

	Experimental n=31/25 %	Control n=42/39 %
Agree	88.0	89.7
Disagree	12.0	10.3

* "Agree" represents combined percentage of strongly agree and agree, and the same holds for "Disagree."

TABLE 40

IDEAL CLASSROOM

	Experimental *n=31 **%			Control n=42 %		
	1	3	5	1	3	5
Teacher Directive	33.3	50.0	16.	56.1	29.3	13.7
Students sit quietly	12.9	29.0	58.1	26.2	40.5	33.3
Desks are moved about	77.4	12.9	9.7	61.0	14.6	24.4
Students teach each other	45.2	45.2	9.7	35.7	47.6	16.6
Students work individually	70.0	23.3	6.6	64.3	19.0	16.6
Exploration and experience	46.7	46.7	6.6	23.8	35.7	21.4
Curriculum textbook oriented	3.2	32.3	67.8	16.7	35.7	47.6
Individuals move in and out of room	29.0	41.9	29.1	21.4	19.0	59.6
Students determine goals	29.1	35.5	35.5	21.4	38.1	40.5
Students determine learning activities	25.8	41.9	32.3	14.2	45.2	40.5

*n missing not greater than 1.

**% response on 5 point semantic differential with #1 indicating combining % of scale item 1 and 2, and the # 5 indicating a combined % of scale item 4 and 5.